

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above identified patent application is hereby respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1 and 18 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, and 4-18 remain in the case.

A petition and Fee for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and payment thereof for an extension is attached hereto.

1. The drawings being acceptable are noted.

2. The recitation of 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph and the rejection of claims 13-17 thereunder, are noted.

It is believed that an understanding of the features was well in possession of the inventors at the time the application was filed. For example, page 7, paragraph 2 of the specification states, "Of course still other ways of closure may be utilized. For example, the strap 30 can be omitted and replaced with a first tie strap 38. Similarly, the hook and loop member 28 can be omitted and replaced with a second tie strap 36. The first and second tie straps 38,

36 are then tied together as desired to secure the top 22 in the closed position whether the luggage 10 is in the open or in the collapsed position."

After a full description of the need for retaining the luggage in the collapsed position has occurred, alternate ways of closure are described in the specification and shown in the drawings. Therefore, the use of the alternate constructions is believed to be conveyed in such a clear manner whereby anyone possessing even an ordinary level of skill in the art could fully understand and use the alternate constructions as shown, described, and claimed in the original application, as filed.

The above paragraph from the specification covers the subject matter of claims 13-15.

Similarly, the last two paragraphs from page 6 and first paragraph on page 7 are believed to similarly well-describe the subject matter of claims 16 and 17 when taken in view of the remainder of the specification and the drawings.

Additionally, as is described in greater detail hereinbelow, claim 1 is indicated as being in condition of

allowance, if amended consistent with the Examiner's very helpful suggestion. This has been accomplished. Accordingly, claim 1 and remaining dependent claims 2 and 4-18 are also believed to be in condition of allowance.

Reconsideration of the rejection to claims 13-17 is respectfully requested.

3. Claims 1 and 18 and remaining dependent claims 2 and 4-17 were rejected under 35 USC 112 but would be allowable if claims 1 and 18 were amended consistent with the Examiner's helpful suggestions. (Actually, claims 2, 4-12, and 18 were indicated as allowable; claims 13-17 would also be allowable if the Examiner agrees with the above response to Office Action item number "2".)

This has been accomplished in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Thank you.

Accordingly, all remaining claims 1, 2, and 4-18 are believed to be in condition of allowance and reconsideration is respectfully requested.


4. It is noted that the objections to the drawings have been withdrawn. Thank you.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4-12, and 18 were indicated as allowable if claims 1 and 18 were rewritten. This has been accomplished. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-12, and 18 are believed to be in condition of allowance as are claims 13-17 for the reasons as stated hereinabove. Reconsideration of all remaining claims is respectfully requested.

6. The Certificate of Mailing form has been reviewed and compared with the instant Certificate of Mailing to ensure that all essential information is presently included with the Certificate of Mailing, as used herein. Thank you.

7. Contact information is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Risto A. Rinne, Jr.  
Reg. # 37,055

2173 East Francisco Blvd.  
Suite E  
San Rafael, CA 94901

1-415-457-6933